

REMARKS

New claims 23-24 are supported at p. 11, lines 16-22 and p. 13, line 27 to p. 14, line 8.

The Advisory Action noted that the amendments requested in the response submitted November 20, 2006 were entered.

The Applicant notes that claim 1 recites,
“A brightness enhancing film **comprising** an optical layer having a linear array of regular right prisms **wherein the prisms consist of the reaction product of a solvent-free polymerizable composition** consisting essentially of . . .”

The Examiner stated that, the Applicant did not prove that “solvent-free” is “substantial material”.

The Applicant submits that the Declaration of David B. Olson submitted Nov. 20, 2006, clearly states on p. 2 (5) that, “For these reasons, a back-to-back comparison to a brightness enhancing film having prism prepared from a polymerizable composition having solvent cannot be made . . .” Accordingly, the Applicant has provided proof that the inclusion of solvent is substantial material.

The Applicant submits that the preamble of this claim is “A brightness enhancing film” followed by the transitional phrase “comprising”. The recitation that “the prisms consist (i.e. closing the claim to the inclusion of material other than those recited except for impurities ordinarily associated therewith” per MPEP 2100.03) of the reaction product of a solvent-free polymerizable composition” is not part of the preamble.

The Applicant reiterates that Olson et al. is not an analogous art reference. The Applicant further submits that Olson et al. teaches a multitude of polymerizable aromatic brominated (meth)acrylate compounds (column 4, line 9 to column 10, line 64) as well as

a multitude of non-brominated compound (column 10, line 65 to column 13, line 14). However, Olson et al. **does not teach the particular combination** of the kinds and amounts of polymerizable compositions being claimed. Further, there is no motivation to select this particular combination based on the teachings of the references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

April 19, 2007

Date

By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833